



United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE-United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	, ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/567,719	02/08/2006	John Dan Mabry	PU030251	3991
24498 7590 01/30/2008 THOMSON LICENSING LLC			EXAMINER	
Two Independence Way			WONG, ALBERT KANG	
Suite 200 PRINCETON, NJ 08540			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1141,021,01,			2612	
	·			
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			01/30/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	10/567,719	MABRY, JOHN DAN				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Albert K. Wong	2612				
The MAILING DATE of this communication Period for Reply	appears on the cover sheet w	vith the correspondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RE WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CF after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory pe - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by si Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the n earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	G DATE OF THIS COMMUN R 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a h. eriod will apply and will expire SIX (6) MO tatute, cause the application to become A	ICATION. reply be timely filed NTHS from the mailing date of this communication. BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 1	5 November 2007.					
2a)⊠ This action is FINAL . 2b)□	This action is FINAL . 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.					
,—	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is					
closed in accordance with the practice und	ler Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.I	D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.				
Disposition of Claims						
4) Claim(s) 1-11 is/are pending in the applica 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are with 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 1-11 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction are	drawn from consideration.					
Application Papers	,	•				
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Exam 10)☑ The drawing(s) filed on <u>08 February 2006</u> is Applicant may not request that any objection to Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the co 11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the	s/are: a) accepted or b) the drawing(s) be held in abeya rrection is required if the drawing	nnce. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). g(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		.•				
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for fore a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority docum 2. Certified copies of the priority docum 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority docum application from the International Bu * See the attached detailed Office action for a	nents have been received. nents have been received in a priority documents have been reau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	Application No n received in this National Stage				
Attachmant(a)						
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date) Paper No	Summary (PTO-413) (s)/Mail Date Informal Patent Application				

10/567,719 Art Unit: 2612

- 1. This Office action is in response to the amendment filed November 15, 2007. Claims 1-11 are pending. Applicant's remarks have been considered and the prior rejections have been withdrawn in view of the amendment and remarks.
- 2. Claims 2 and 7 are objected to because of the following informalities: The claims have an extra period. Appropriate correction is required.
- 3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

4. Claims 1-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Hayes et al (6,223,348).

Regarding claim 1, Figure 1 shows the claimed remote control with a plurality of keypads arranged in groupings based on functionality. It is clear that the shape and location of the

10/567,719 Art Unit: 2612

keypads and groupings enable the user to operate the universal remote control. The claimed grouping of navigation keys that are centrally located are shown as the select keys.

Regarding claim 2, Figure 1 shows at least groupings for navigation keys and a grouping for number keys.

Regarding claim 3, see spacing between numbers keys and volume keys.

Regarding claims 4 and 5, see shape of number keys and volume keys.

- 5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 6. Claims 6-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hayes et al.

Regarding claim 6, this claim is essentially the same as claim 1 with the inclusion of at least one remotely controllable appliance. While, Hayes does not show the remotely controlled appliance, it would have been obvious to include such an item in a system since that is the purpose of the remote control unit. The items are designed to have utility when used together.

Regarding claims 7-10, these limitations have been addressed in prior claims.

Regarding claim 11, see keys around item 11 in Figure 1.

7. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Art Unit: 2612

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Albert K. Wong whose telephone number is 571-272-3057. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Brian A. Zimmerman can be reached on 571-272-3059. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Albert K. Wong January 24, 2008